	Case 2:25-cv-00028-DC-CKD Documer	nt 7 Filed 02/18/25	Page 1 of 2		
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	HENRY ORTIZ,	No. 2:25-cv-00028-	DC-SCR (PS)		
12	Plaintiff,				
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTIN	G FINDINGS AND		
14	DOUG V. MULL, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE			
15	Defendants.	RELIEF			
16		(Doc. Nos. 3, 6)			
17	Plaintiff Henry Ortiz is proceeding pro se in this civil action. This matter was referred to a				
18	United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. (Doc.				
19	No. 4.)				
20	On January 21, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations				
21	recommending Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 3) be denied. (Doc. No. 6.)				
22	Specifically, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's local rules				
23	relating to requests for injunctive relief. (Id.) Additionally, the magistrate judge found the court				
24	must abstain from interference with the pending state court unlawful detainer action pursuant to				
25	binding precedent. (Id.) The magistrate judge further found Plaintiff cannot show a likelihood of				
26	success on the merits as required for injunctive relief, because Plaintiff has not stated a				
27	cognizable claim. (Id.) Those findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and				
28	contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days from the				
		1			

	Case 2:25-cv-00028-DC-CKD Document 7 Filed 02/18/25 Page 2 of 2				
1	date of service. (<i>Id.</i> at 7.) To date, no objections have been filed, and the time in which to do so				
2	has now passed.				
3	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this				
4	court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the				
5	court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper				
6	analysis.				
7	Accordingly,				
8	1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 21, 2025 (Doc. No. 6) are				
9	adopted in full;				
10	2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 3) is denied; and				
11	3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further				
12	proceedings.				
13					
14	IT IS SO ODDEDED				
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
16	Dated: February 18, 2025 Dena Coggins				
17	United States District Judge				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
2526					
27					
28					
_~					